

**INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION & VALIDATION SERVICES  
FOR THE  
CALIFORNIA CHILD SUPPORT AUTOMATED SYSTEM (CCSAS) AND PRE-  
STATEWIDE INTERIM SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT (PRISM) PROGRAMS**

**DELIVERABLE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT  
MONTHLY PLANNING OVERSIGHT REPORTS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>MONTHLY PLANNING OVERSIGHT REPORTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SCOPE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CONTENT.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>METHODS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ANALYSIS INPUTS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CRITERIA AND STANDARDS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF “MONTHLY PLANNING OVERSIGHT REPORTS” .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b><i>Attachment 1 – Table of Contents for Monthly Planning Oversight Report</i></b>	
<b><i>Attachment 2 – Initial List of Analysis/Evaluation Criteria</i></b>	

## INTRODUCTION

This document provides a comprehensive description of the Monthly Planning Oversight Report (MPOR). It describes the scope and content of this deliverable, the methods and tools to be used to conduct the review, and the criteria and standards to be applied.

## GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

KPMG Consulting will provide 14 Monthly Planning Oversight Reports, commencing in April 2001 and ending in July 2002 in conjunction with the planned procurements activities for the California Child Support Automation System (CCSAS). We will prepare and deliver these documents in an electronic format that cannot be modified so as to protect the integrity of the document and verify the independence of our effort. Additionally, we will provide a hard copy of the report.

## SCOPE

The scope of our activities in conjunction with Planning Oversight will be in accordance with the eight Planning Oversight tasks delineated in the "Statement of Work, Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Services, version 2" dated March 2001. The MPOR focuses on the planning activities for the CCSAS project. This includes Procurement Planning and Feasibility Planning. While Procurement Planning focuses on the strategies and activities relative to the securing of a qualified business partner (QBP) to develop the CCSAS solution, the Feasibility planning focuses on those activities needed to validate the solution approach and its benefits to the State. Feasibility planning also considers the oversight and budgetary aspects of the project.

Relative to procurement activities, the MPOR will report on our evaluation of [L1] the procurement strategy, plans, processes and artifacts to verify that they are valid, reasonable and consistent relative to the project goals. It will focus on the strategic vision for the project and how well the tactical procurement and feasibility activities reflect the goals of the State and Federal Child support programs. Equally important[L2], it focuses on how well the State translates its objectives into metrics and measures by which potential vendors can be evaluated, and how well it communicates all relevant project aspects to vendors. Complete communications among all project stakeholders, including QBPs, increases the probability that the procurement activities will yield a vendor solution that most appropriately supports project objectives and shares project risk.

The MPOR will also evaluate the Feasibility Planning activities, looking at not only the methods by which the State will develop the FSR, but the accuracy of the resultant document itself. Additionally, it will look at key planning components included within the Planning Advance Planning Documents, such as project management planning, project budget planning, and cost allocation planning. This report will not address the actual implementation of Project Management activities; these will be addressed by the Management Oversight sections of the Quarterly Report and monthly updates.

## CONTENT

Attachment 1 includes the Table of Contents for the MPOR. It directly maps to KPMG Consulting's statement of work and provides a qualitative analysis of the planning oversight findings and suggests recommended remediation activities as appropriate. Additionally, the MPOR includes sections that describe the background, scope and methodology for our planning oversight activities; it is anticipated that these sections will remain fairly consistent over time. It provides for an "Executive Summary" that summarizes findings and recommendations, and a "Progress" section that summarizes the progress made/lost by the project teams, relative to the measurement criteria, since the date of the previous report.

## METHODS

KPMG Consulting will utilize a consistent methodology to conduct the required verification and validation activities. Through the review of documents, diagrams, calculations and other printed materials pertinent to each phase of the CCSAS Procurement, our team will verify that appropriate and reasonable activities have been planned and performed. Additionally, our team will attend scheduled procurement meetings as observers, and will conduct group and individual interviews in order to validate that the activities performed are appropriate and sufficient to meet the needs identified through planning. Our team will utilize checklists, interview guides, and findings development tools to aid consistency and communication among all team members.

We will document findings and recommendations based on our observations of the procurement activities. These findings and recommendations will be provided in a manner consistent with the structure of the Statement of Work:

1. Determine the relevant input documents, project meetings and interviews [L3]for the assessment
2. Develop the criteria, relative to current project status and SOW activities PO1.1 – PO1.8.
3. Attend meetings, [L4]focusing on group interaction, communication, process and outcomes.
4. Analyze input documentation using the criteria from Activity 2.
5. Develop the findings and recommendations.
6. Assess and document changes for prior assessments.
7. Prepare MPOR document.

Each MPOR will confirm that this methodology was used, or will describe and explain any modifications made for that specific report. Note that the checklists are living documents that will be updated and refined through the MPOR process.

## ANALYSIS INPUTS

The phase of the project life cycle will directly affect the analysis inputs we utilize. Our analysis inputs include project documents, meetings and interviews. Below is a sampling of the types of meetings we will attend: [L5]:

- [L6] Executive Staff meetings
- Joint Coordination meetings
- Federal Conference calls and videoconferences
- Qualified Business Partner non-confidential and confidential meetings
- Vendor presentations
- Planning and strategy meetings

KPMG Consulting will review project documents applicable to the appropriate life-cycle phase. Below is an anticipated document review list:

- All Communications provided to Vendors (non-confidential)
- User Needs Statements
- Initial Project Plan
- System Specifications and Sub-Specifications
- Application Management Plan
- Systems Management Plan
- Requirements Allocation Matrix
- Planning and Prioritization Database
- Final Project Plans
- Re-Use Strategies
- Release Contents
- Logical Data Models
- Re-Host Requirements
- Business Process Models
- Test Plans, Cases, and Scripts
- Enterprise Data and Activity Models
- Release Plans
- Software Product Plans
- Detailed Test Plans
- Product documentation
- Test and Evaluation Management Plans

- Defect and Complexity Analyses
- User Training Plans
- Task Order Plans
- Risk Management Plan
- Quality Management Plan
- Control and Reporting Plans
- Communication Plan
- Procurement Plan
- Resource Management Plan
- Tool Development Plans
- System Quality Assurance and Quality Assurance Plans
- Metrics Plan
- Software Assurance Plan
- Documentation Standard Plan
- Code Standard Plan
- Configuration Management Plan
- Change Management Plan
- Interface Control Plan
- Defect Analysis and Resolution Plan
- In-Process Reviews
- Test Readiness Reviews
- System Readiness Reviews
- Cost Benefits Analysis
- Total Cost of Ownership Plan
- Software Maintainability Plan
- Software Requirements Review
- Critical Design Review documents
- Acceptance Test Plans
- Code Inspection and Walk-through documents
- Unit Testing and Data Structure Review documents
- Organization Change Management – Workforce Transition Plan
- Operation and Maintainability Plan

Engineering Change proposals

- Lab Configuration plans and models
- Customer Satisfaction plans
- Fielding and Integration Plan
- Security Management Plan
- Security Policy
- Contingency Plans
- Data Cut-Over and Conversion Plans
- Lessons Learned

KPMG Consulting will conduct interviews on an as-needed basis. Each Quarterly Report will detail the documents reviewed (citing version numbers when provided/appropriate), meetings attended and interviews conducted.

## CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

KPMG will use a variety of accepted standards for assessing the Planning activities. These include the Clinger-Cohen Act, Carnegie Mellon SEI Capabilities Maturity Model, and the Project Management Institute standards for Project Planning. Recognizing that the State of California is not required to adhere to any of these standards at this time, we will use them to identify and document best practices relative to procurement and planning activities.

Additionally, we will use the Federal Feasibility Study Report guidelines for assessing the appropriateness of the Feasibility Study methodology, Cost Benefit Analysis format and content, and other areas as appropriate. We will also use the State's guidelines.

We have created a high-level list of questions and inferred criteria from these standards and will use them to guide our analysis activities. The initial list of MPOR criteria is included at Attachment 2. These checklists are living documents that will be updated and refined through the MPOR process. In their current state they are not all inclusive, as criteria will be driven in large part by the progress of the project to date as well as findings that themselves suggest additional or alternative focus is required. For example, while Attachment 2 includes general criteria for the analysis of the Feasibility Study, actual criteria will be driven by the approach that the State takes to Feasibility Planning and cannot be fully defined at the time of this DED. Additionally, some criteria that are appropriate for the initial MPOR may be outdated for subsequent reviews, as activities may have passed. Each MPOR will include an attachment listing all criteria used for the time-specific analysis.

## REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF "MONTHLY PLANNING OVERSIGHT REPORTS"

As a monthly recurring deliverable, the Monthly Planning Oversight Reports will need to be reviewed on a more expedited cycle than that described in the Statement of Work, Item 4c. The schedule and timing of the deliverable review will be as follows:

1. KPMG Consulting will submit deliverable to HHSDC Project Manager and ACF designee by agreed upon date.
2. HHSDC Project Manager will submit deliverable to all named and agreed upon stakeholders within 2 business days.
3. Stakeholders will review and provide HHSDC with a formal response to findings, recommendations, and conclusions within 5 business days following receipt of deliverable.
4. HHSDC Project Manager will compile comments and return to KPMG Consulting within 3 business days.
5. KPMG Consulting will review all comments, append to the original deliverable with responses as appropriate, and resubmit the deliverable to the HHSDC Project Manager and ACF designee within 5 business days.
6. HHSDC will review and approve the resubmitted deliverable, thus releasing any associated invoice retainage for payment, within 3 business days.

The entire review/comment/resubmit/approve cycle will take no more than a total of 18 business days. This will provide response in a manner timely enough that stakeholder feedback, comments, or questions can be incorporated into subsequent Planning Oversight Reports.



## Attachment 1 –

## Table of Contents and Description for Monthly Planning Oversight Report

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>PLANNING OVERSIGHT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Procurement .....</i>	<i>10</i>
- State and Federal Project Objectives (1.1) .....	10
- Solicitation Documentation (1.2) .....	10
- Evaluation Criteria (1.3) .....	10
- Defined Vendor Roles and Responsibilities (1.4) .....	10
- IV&V Contractual Obligations (1.5) .....	10
- Procurement Recommendations .....	10
<i>Feasibility Study .....</i>	<i>11</i>
- Feasibility Study Methodology (1.6) .....	11
- PAPD and IAPD (1.7) .....	11
- Cost Benefit Analysis Review (1.8) .....	11
- Feasibility Study Recommendations .....	11
<b>PLANNING OVERSIGHT SUMMARY AND/OR NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>11</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Provide an overview of the report, its general purpose, and the main findings developed below. This section may be excerpted for status reports (our and theirs), meeting minutes, and other summaries, and thus should be reasonably complete at a high level independent of the following sections.

## BACKGROUND

This is the background of the child support automation projects and our work within it. We do not expect that it will change a lot from one report to the next.

## SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Outline the scope and objectives of the particular report. This section could/should be fairly specific regarding the intent of the report and what was within the scope of the team preparing the report.

## METHODOLOGY

Use this section to describe what the team reviewed, the context in which they reviewed, and the approved methodology used to analyze it (if applicable). This section will change from one type of review to another, but should not change much between updates of the same type of report. Ideally, we will be selecting a methodology for each class or type of review and sticking to it from month to month.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### *Planning Oversight*

#### **Procurement**

- **State and Federal Project Objectives (1.1)**
- **Solicitation Documentation (1.2)**
- **Evaluation Criteria (1.3)**
- **Defined Vendor Roles and Responsibilities (1.4)**
- **IV&V Contractual Obligations (1.5)**
- **Procurement Recommendations**

## **Feasibility Study**

- **Feasibility Study Methodology (1.6)**
- **PAPD and IAPD (1.7)**
- **Cost Benefit Analysis Review (1.8)**
- **Feasibility Study Recommendations**

## **PLANNING OVERSIGHT SUMMARY AND/OR NEXT STEPS**

When applicable to the report, summarize the main points and the most important recommendations. In many ongoing reports, this section will be more appropriately used to describe the anticipated focus of the next month's report or to note particular progress/issues relative to the previous period's report.

Page: 3

[L1]Instead of evaluate, “report on our evaluation of” – updated, ba

Page: 3

[L2]Shouldn't it be “Equally important”, rather than “importantly”? updated, ba

Page: 4

[L3]Are you defining “tools” as documents and project meetings? Include interviews...updated,ba.

Page: 4

[L4]How will you measure which meetings are relevant, and which are not? Updated, ba

Page: 5

[L5]“Current versions of the following documents and *meetings*? That seems confusing – there are no current versions of meetings. Updated, ba

Page: 5

[L6] I think it would be helpful to organize this section into “Meetings”; “Literature Review”, and so forth. Updated, ba